

**REMARKS**

In light of the above amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

Claims 7, 8, 14-16 and 22-44 amended claims 1-6, 9-13 and 17-21 are in this application.

At paragraph 2 of the outstanding Final Office Action of January 29, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 9 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Wagensooner et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,812,903). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Amended independent claim 9, recites in part, "A video processing device ...comprising substantially all of said input data region and for selecting one of a plurality of output data correction characteristics...**wherein said plurality of output data correction characteristics are based on characteristics of a video source, characteristics of an image display device and visual characteristics.**" (Underlining and Bold added for emphasis.)

It is respectfully submitted that the reference relied upon by the Examiner does not teach the above-recited feature of amended independent claim 9.

Wagensonner suggests characteristic functions that may curve continuously or that may be composed of a plurality of straight-line segments (column 14, lines 5-9) and Look-Up-Tables containing several of these characteristic functions, which are associated with respective brightness levels (column 15, lines 32-37). However, Wagensonner does not suggest or teach a plurality of output data correction characteristics that are based on characteristics of a video source, characteristics of an image display device and visual characteristics, as does amended independent claim 9. Support for this feature can be found at page 8, lines 8-23 of the present specification.

Wagensonner merely discloses Look-Up-Tables for a color matrixing unit 10 (column 6, lines 61-67), for an antilogarithmic unit 11 (column 7, lines 2-12) and a gray balancing unit 12 (column 7, lines 24-32) that are only associated with brightness levels. In other words, the data correction characteristics are independent of input/output devices and function only based on known relationships, such as a luminance-chrominance relationship (column 11, lines 26-68). Fig. 4 of Wagensonner illustrates a luminance-chrominance coordinate system displaying color vectors where colors with a low degree of saturation lie near the origin and colors with a high-degree of saturation lie farther out. Therefore, the correction characteristics are based on modifying the relationship between the chrominance and luminance of a signal.

*not in claim* In contrast, in the present invention, the correction characteristics are based on hardware, such as the digital video source or the type of display. Therefore, the present invention compensates for the different hardware that can be utilized for various applications. Indeed, Wagensonner does not allow such control over correcting luminance data or color difference data based on characteristics of a video source, characteristics of an image display device and

visual characteristics. Therefore amended independent claim 9 is believed to be distinguishable from Wagensooner.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to amended independent claim 9, amended independent claim 17 is also believed to be distinguishable from Wagensooner.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 9 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

At paragraph 4 of the outstanding Final Office Action of January 29, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 6, 10, 27-36, 39 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagensooner et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,812,903). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Amended independent claim 1 has been amended in a similar fashion to amended independent claim 9 and therefore is distinguishable for at least the reasons described above. Therefore amended independent claim 1 is believed to be distinguishable from Wagensooner.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to amended independent claim 1, amended independent claims 2, 3, 5, 6 and 10 are also believed to be distinguishable from Wagensooner.

Claims 27-36, 39 and 40 are dependent from one of amended independent claims 1-3, 5, 6 and 10 and, due to such dependency, are also believed to be distinguishable from Wagensooner for at least the reasons previously described. Therefore, claims 27-36, 39 and 40 are believed to be distinguishable from Wagensooner.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 6, 10, 27-36, 39 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

At paragraph 5 of the outstanding Final Office Action of January 29, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 4, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14-16, 18-21, 37, 38 and 41-44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagensonner et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,812,903) in view of Lee (U.S. Patent No. 5,546,134). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Amended independent claims 4, 11, 12 and 18-21 have been amended in a similar fashion to amended independent claim 9 and therefore are distinguishable for at least the reasons described above.

Claims 7, 8, 14-16, 37, 38 and 41-44 are dependent from one of amended independent claims 4, 11, 12 and 18-21 and, due to such dependency, are also believed to be distinguishable from Wagensonner for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner did not rely on Lee to overcome the above-identified deficiencies of Wagensonner. Therefore, claims 7, 8, 14-16, 37, 38 and 41-44 are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Wagensonner and Lee.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 4, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14-16, 18-21, 37, 38 and 41-44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

At paragraph 6 of the outstanding Final Office Action of January 29, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 13 and 22-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagensonner et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,812,903) in view of Lee (U.S. Patent No. 5,546,134) and further in view of Kohler (U.S. Patent No. 5,615,312). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Amended independent claim 13 has been amended in a similar fashion to amended independent claim 9 and therefore is distinguishable for at least the reasons described above.

Claims 22-28 are dependent from one of the amended independent claims and, due to such dependency, are also believed to be distinguishable from Wagensonner and Lee for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner did not rely on Kohler to overcome the above-identified deficiencies of Wagensonner and Lee. Therefore, claims 22-28 are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Wagensonner, Lee and Kohler.


Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 13 and 22-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

It is to be appreciated that the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art represent the present opinions of the applicant's undersigned attorney and, in the event, that the Examiner disagrees with any such opinions, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where in the reference or references, there is a basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

By   
Gordon M. Kessler  
Reg. No. 38,511  
(212) 588-0800